

Amendments to the Drawings:

The Examiner noted in paragraph 1 of the Office Action that "...Reference number 20 cited in the specification on page 6, line 3 of the paragraph [0024]" was not included in the drawings. In response, Applicants amend Fig. 4 (Sheet 4/4) to include reference number 20 pointing to "the improved heat dissipating apparatus 20 of the present invention" which is disposed in a generally modular housing. Applicants attach a copy of amended sheet 4/4, labeled in the top margin, "Replacement Sheet".

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 4/4

Remarks

I. General Comments.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his time and courtesy in a telephone interview on January 18, 2006. In the interview, the Examiner agreed that paragraph 5 on page 4 of the Office action is in error, the original Office action wording stating: "Claims 8 and 12 would be allowable..." The Examiner agreed that paragraph 5 should correctly read: "Claims 2 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objection, set forth in this Office action."

Applicants further thank the Examiner for clearly identifying claims that are allowable upon correction of informalities.

II. Objections to Drawings.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner states "The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following sign(s) mentioned in the description: Reference number 20 cited in the specification on page 6, line 3 of the paragraph [0024].

In response, Applicants amends Fig. 4 to add reference numeral 20 generally referring to the heat dissipating apparatus disposed in modular housing assembly 18 between sidewall portions 22, 24. An attached replacement drawing of sheet 4/4 (Fig. 4) has been provided in the "Amendments to Drawings" above.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

On paragraph 4 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states: "Claims 1 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kosugi.

In response, Applicants cancel claims 1 and 8-11.

IV. Claim Objections.

On paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office action, the Examiner states: "Claims 1, 2, 8 and 12 are objected to" because of informalities. Claims 1 and 8-11 have been cancelled responsive to the 35 USC 102(b) rejection above. Claims 2 and 12 claim "a free-floating circuit board". The Examiner correctly points out that the "...the specification discloses: 'The printed circuit board 40 is mounted for limited free-floating movement within the housing assembly, in a vertical direction'".

In response, Applicants amend Claims 2 and 12 to conform to the disclosure of the specification. Applicants believe that Claim 2 and its dependent claims 3-7; and Claim 12 and its dependent claims 13-15, are allowable as amended.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing comments and amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application, including Claims 2-7 and 12-15, are in condition for allowance and request that the application should be passed to issue.

Date: January 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: Robert R. Williams

Telephone: (507) 253-2761
Fax No.: (507) 253-2382

Robert R. Williams, Agent
Registration No.: 48,395
IBM Corporation - Department 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, Minnesota 55901-7829